

Serial No.: 10/072,000
Attorney Docket No.: 10012134-1
RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
AUG 31 2006

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated June 8, 2006, the Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 11, 14, 24, 27 and 30 and canceled claims 2-3 and 16. Claims 1, 4-15 and 17-33 remain in the case. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are requested.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as allegedly being indefinite.

In response, the Applicants have amended appropriate claims as suggested by the Examiner to overcome this rejection.

The Office Action rejected claims 1, 4-6, 11-14, 19, 24 and 27-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Love et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,091,508) in view of Minamizawa et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,298,421). The Office Action rejected claims 2, 10, 15, 17, 18, 23, 25 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Love et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,091,508) in view of Minamizawa et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,298,421) and further in view of Yang (U.S. Patent No. 6,467,087). The Office Action rejected claims 7, 9, 20 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Love et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,091,508) in view of Minamizawa et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,298,421) and further in view of Kim et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,473,788). The Office Action rejected claims 8 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Love et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,091,508) in view of Minamizawa et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,298,421) and further in view of Siwinski et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0015066). Last, the Office Action rejected claims 30-35 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Love et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,091,508) in view of Minamizawa et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,298,421) and further in view of Venkatraman et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 5,956,487).

The Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections based on the amendments to the claims and the arguments below.

In particular, the Applicants contend that combined references do not disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of the Applicants' claimed invention.

However, the Examiner stated that claim 36 was allowed and claims 3 and 16 were

Serial No.: 10/072,000
Attorney Docket No.: 10012134-1

allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims. Thus, although the Applicants contend that all of the claims are allowable before the present amendment, in an effort to expedite the prosecution of this case, the Applicants have added the allowable limitations of claim 3 to claims 1, 11, 24, 27 and 30 and added the allowable limitations of claim 16 to claim 14. Hence, the Applicants submit that the independent claims are now allowable. Consequently, the Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are moot.


With regard to the dependent claims, because they depend from the above-argued respective independent claims, and they contain additional limitations that are patentably distinguishable over the cited references, these claims are also considered to be patentable (MPEP § 2143.03).

Thus, it is respectfully requested that all of the claims be allowed based on the amendments and arguments. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. Additionally, in an effort to further the prosecution of the subject application, the Applicants kindly **request** the Examiner to telephone the Applicants' attorney at **(818) 885-1575**.

Please note that all mail correspondence should continue to be directed to

Hewlett Packard Company
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

Respectfully submitted,
Dated: August 31, 2006



Edmond A. DeFrank
Reg. No. 37,814
Attorney for Applicants
(818) 885-1575 TEL
(818) 885-5750 FAX